Presented to him by the Author

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EPISCOPACY:

A

SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE CONSECRATION

OF THE RIGHT REV.

WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, D.D.

FIRST BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA,

AND THE RIGHT REV.

GEORGE JEHOSHAPHAT MOUNTAIN, D.D.

FIRST BISHOP OF MONTREAL, LOWER CANADA.

BY THE

REV. I. E. N. MOLESWORTH, M.A.

DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HON. & REV. THE EARL OF GUILFORD,

RECTOR OF ST. MARTIN'S, CANTERBURY,

AND ONE OF THE SIX PREACHERS OF CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL.

PUBLISHED BY COMMAND OF HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1836.

Price 1*s.* 6*d.*

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA.

My dear Lord Bishop,

Had I regarded this dedication as a tribute to your Lordship in your public capacity, I should have deemed it a privilege, as well as a duty, to have associated with your name that of the tried and honoured fellow-labourer in the cause of Christ, who was consecrated with you. And it will be no disparagement to either him or your Lordship to add, that, if I had been influenced by no other desire than that of gracing my humble production with the highest name, I should have solicited

permission to inscribe it with that of the illustrious individual who commanded its publication—whose pre-eminence, not only in station, but in talents and Christian graces, is universally acknowledged —and who, I delight on all fitting occasions, with honest pride and heartfelt gratitude, to state, took, only on public grounds, an humble Curate from a village, and laid his paternal injunctions on him to do his duty to our blessed Lord and in the Church, in the metropolitan city of his own diocese.

But here public considerations have been put aside for the indulgence of those feelings of private friendship and esteem, on which you have permitted me to offer this dedication. And most sincere is the gratification I experience in recording these sentiments.

Ere you can receive this, the wide waste of waters and half the globe will be between us; and, as far as short-sighted man can judge, it is probable that we shall meet no more, unless in the presence of Him before whom we must one day give account of our respective stewardships. Deeply as I regret being thus deprived of the

opportunities (few as they were) of "taking sweet counsel together," I derive from the circumstance at least one consolation—it effectually secures this humble tribute from all semblance, or suspicion of flattery.

Many coincidences in our career, known to you, but not necessary to be explained here, contributed to increase the gratification I felt in being selected to preach on your consecration, but none more than that of having my name associated with one who, I have good reason to hope, will, by the help of the Holy Ghost, prove himself a true Israelite, a worthy successor of the Apostles, and a good Bishop of that Episcopal Church of which the faithful Martyrs, and pious and learned defenders, will one day "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." I know full well that your field is an arduous one, that many a thorn and briar is planted there, and many a snare and stumbling block will be laid for your feet. But I trust that your prayers and ours on your consecration were not vain. May they have reached the Mercy Seat,—and may you find yourself strong

"In His dear might who walk'd the wave,"

and will bear up his faithful servants in all the dangers and troubles which may assault them! To Him, to His grace, to His merits, and to His mercy, I heartily commend you, and

Have the honor to be,

With all respect and esteem,

My dear Lord Bishop,

Yours most faithfully,

I. E. N. MOLESWORTH.

TO THE READER.

To those at all acquainted with the question, and the many dissertations written upon it, the Author need scarcely observe, that the view of the foundations of Episcopacy taken in a Sermon must be a very cursory and imperfect one. However, though a complete treatise may not be practicable within such limits, an useful one may be. And this has been the object aimed at. He has hoped that, by a judicious selection of the points on which his sketch will touch, it may be made like a rough map, which, though it may not distinguish every bye-path and cross road, yet may so indicate the general plan of the country, and the direction of the principal roads, as to guard the traveller from being led far astray by fallacious representations, or treacherous guides. Those who desire to search more deeply, will find abundance of information in Bilson, Andrewes, Jer. Taylor, Hall,

Hammond, Dodwell, Hooker, Barrow, Heylin, and Potter.

The collections of these learned men, as well as his own many avocations, as Editor of a weekly publication, parish priest, and father of a family, have induced him to make his references less copious than might perhaps have been expected. Seldom a day passes, at the close of which he cannot appreciate, as well as the hardest labourer, the luxury of laying his head on his pillow. He claims, therefore, indulgence for any seeming carelessness. For the same reasons, not distinguishing his cause, he has declined the discussion of controverted texts; and also because his object is to defend the principles of his own Church, not to condemn others. He has not read the arguments on both sides without feeling that good men may view them in a light different from that in which they appear to him. And he hopes they will offer up their prayers in the same spirit of charity for him as he does for them, that "all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

A

SERMON,

&c.

2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom;—Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine.

This charge I affirm to have been addressed to Timothy, as *Bishop* of Ephesus. It enforces, in few and emphatic words, some very important duties of the episcopal office; it is couched in language expressive of an earnestness and affection correspondent to the responsibility of his situation, and to the circumstances under which the injunctions are uttered by St. Paul—when he was under a strong conviction, if not a special assurance, that the "time of his departure was at hand[1]," and

[1] Verses 6, 7.

that Timothy must shortly be deprived of his counsels.

The course which I propose to pursue in preaching from this text may be indicated under the two following heads:

I. I shall endeavour to give a general sketch of the foundations of our episcopal polity; and also specially notice some passages in the Epistles to Timothy, confirming my assertion that the text was addressed to him as a *Bishop*.

II. I shall take occasion to offer a few observations with reference to the solemnity which we are assembled to witness.

My position is defensive, not aggressive. I am not solicitous to put forward the negation which it may include; but the principle cannot be compromised, whatsoever inferences may be drawn from it. The episcopal polity of our Church is founded on the *ordinance of Christ*, and the *practice of the Apostles*, and the *testimony of the Church* (*universal for one thousand five hundred years*), and thence continued, though controverted, to this day.

The proofs of these foundations of episcopacy may be contemplated in two different points of view. We may either take the direct testimony of Scriptures, and then compare it with the subsequent records and practice of the Church; or we may survey the records and practice of the Church in various ages, and then see how far the inferences drawn from that survey harmonize with the direct

testimony of Scripture. I have preferred the latter course, because it appears to be equally convenient for general purposes, and to possess this particular advantage—that it places in a clearer light the comparative strength of the positions of the advocates and of the opponents of episcopacy, and also the nature of that testimony which our *position* (antecedently to the Scriptural evidences we can adduce) entitles us to challenge on their part before we can be shaken.

So sensible of our decided advantage, with respect to the testimony of the Church, are those who would decry our apostolical polity [1], that they have endeavoured to diminish its force by a taunt. They tell us, that in laying great stress upon this testimony, we give a sanction to the Romanist, and fall into his error of setting the testimony of the Church above Scripture, and making tradition the rule of faith. But the language of our Articles, and of our standard writers [2], is too explicit and guarded to be confounded by a mere taunt. We maintain, clearly and undeniably, the paramount authority of God's word, and that no testimony of

[1] Archdeacon Balguy, Disc. VI. VII., has some very sensible remarks on the absurdity of confining the evidence of this question to the Scriptures only, and rejecting entirely the evidence of the Church.

[2] Jer. Taylor, in his dedication to his "Episcopacy Asserted," has pointed out the distinctions in this case with his usual felicity.

the Church could establish any doctrine or practice contrary to the letter or the spirit of Scripture [1]. And because the Romanist has attached an undue and excessive authority to the testimony of the Church, we are not therefore to rush into the opposite extreme, and ascribe to it no weight at all. The Church, though not infallible, is a most valuable and a most venerable witness. By its practice, and the writings of the early fathers, we have been enabled to *confirm* our faith in many points of great importance—such, for example, as the canon of Scripture, the observance of the Lord's day, and the practice of infant baptism. The present case is one of which the very circumstances would lead us to anticipate the usefulness, not to say necessity, of our looking for *illustration* of Scripture principles in *subsequent practice*. Even in faith and morals, the Gospel generally lays down only *principles*, with few and incidental illustrations of their application to the innumerable and ever-changing combinations and contingencies of human life. Have we not even greater reason to expect this peculiarity to prevail with respect to the principles of Church polity? We can, at first, look for nothing more than the *model* and *principles* to be laid down. Their application to the various positions in which the Churches may be placed by external circumstances could be only partially

[1] Art. VI. XX. XXXIV.

developed, because the positions themselves could be only partially encountered. In both the above cases, but especially in that of discipline and polity, the voice of the universal Church is entitled to great weight. But, in the primitive Church, the notices of the details are less precise, and the recognition of the general principle often, indeed usually, only incidental.

General exhortations to faith and holiness, seldom adverting to the form of Church government, and then referring only to universally-acknowledged principles rather than controversial distinctions or the details of official practice, characterize the writings of the early fathers, and are such as we should look for in addresses of an infant and *progressive* Church. This may be illustrated by the analogous case of the different creeds of the Church, in which the *increasing precision* of the Church's testimony may be traced from the few words and first principles addressed to the early converts by St. Peter [1]—the larger form of that creed called the Apostles'—the increasing distinctions of the Nicene—to the elaborate definitions of the Athanasian—each retaining the fundamental doctrines, but developing their application to particular points, as occasion arose, and innovations were attempted.

From these observations on the nature of the

[1] Acts ii. 38.

evidence we might expect, let us proceed to a cursory examination of that which actually presents itself. From the second century to the Reformation, the ground is uncontested[1]. Not a tittle of evidence is adduced by our opponents to gainsay the universal establishment of episcopacy: no council acknowledges any other polity[2]. In *all* Churches, however remote, and however at variance in other points, episcopacy, with its exclusive power of conferring orders and its pre-eminence in authority, is recognized[3]. Even in our

[1] Our learned Stillingfleet, in his "Irenicum," (a work of which he lived to change his opinion,) cites the case of Scotland, that it was governed only by Presbyters from A.D. 263 to the coming of Palladius, A.D. 430. It can only excite a smile when this instance is so pompously brought forward, to find it resting on the authority of John de Fordun, an historian of no general repute, much less in the dark and remote events of that age and country, and writing himself in the sixteenth century. If the case rested on good authority, it would be a solitary exception, proving the rule. The case of the Gothic Church, and more occasional interruptions of two or three episcopacies for a few years, are merely cases in which accident or violence cause a temporary suspension of the episcopal functions from necessity. But no attempt is made to adduce a case of any Church voluntarily and formally setting up any other than episcopacy as the polity of Christian community.

[2] The Council of Carthage ordains that Presbyters may assist the [redacted]in ordaining ministers, by placing their hands near his; but no authority can be found, in either the Church or Scripture, for a mere Presbyter ordaining.—Vide Bingham.

[3] The case of Ærius, who was condemned as an heretic, and

then unfrequented island, though it is supposed by some to have received Christianity from St. Paul himself, and certainly, from a very early period, episcopacy came with Christianity; and notwithstanding all the intervening barbarism and vicissitudes, was found flourishing at the coming of Augustine in the sixth century.

Eusebius, who has been truly styled the father of ecclesiastical history, speaks of episcopacy in his time as a matter on which no doubt existed, and even gives the order of the succession of many Bishops[1] of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, and Alex-

never formed a Church upon his own principles, is no exception. Jerome, who has been the great authority in contending for primitive equality in dignity of the Presbyters with the Bishop, yet asserts, in direct terms, that the Bishop had the exclusive privilege of ordaining, and implies, in other respects, his superiority of office. He admits, too, that superiority of the Bishop was established in the time of the Apostles. The utmost point to which our opponents pretend to carry his testimony is, that, during a considerable part of the time that the Apostles exercised episcopal authority over the Churches, there were no Bishops, but only Presbyters, and those, of course, equal in each Church. But those Presbyters were not thereby Bishops, nor the episcopal office and authority, because *exercised by the Apostles themselves*, not in existence. This would prove nothing, even though we gave up other and earlier testimonies to his, and allowed this to be the correct interpretation of his views, which we do not.—See Bilson, 221.

[1] "This," says Archbishop Potter, "was the rise of episcopacy, according to Eusebius: and in the following parts of his history he has given us such exact and authentic catalogues of

andria, as Irenæus and Tertullian had done before him. Blondel, the most learned of the opponents of episcopacy, is compelled to admit that it had reared its head so early as the year of our Lord 140, only forty years after the death of St. John, and when many, who must have remembered that Apostle, if not others, and their polity, must have been living. In the primitive fathers, the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are mentioned, and mentioned incidentally, not controversially, but as we should expect a subject to be mentioned which was notorious—on which no difference of opinion existed [1].

the Bishops who presided in all the principal cities of the Roman empire, from the Apostles down to his own time, that it is as impossible for an impartial man, who shall compare this historian with the rest of the primitive fathers, whether there was a succession of Bishops from the Apostles, as it would be to call in question the succession of Roman emperors from Julius Cæsar, or the accession of kings in any other country."—See also Bilson, Perpet. Govt., &c., 260, 261.

[1] It is admitted by Blondel and others, that episcopacy had established itself A.D. 140. If, therefore, any other form had been the apostolical one, there would have been probably some *controversial distinctions* observed in the passages in which the term ἐπίσκοπος occurs. But, if no doubt of its apostolical authority existed, then we should expect the mention of it such as we find it. Peirce, Vind. Dissent., says, "The writers of the second century began, I confess, to distinguish the names of Bishop and Presbyter." Is it probable that, when this *distinction* was made so *early*, no controversy should have arisen, nor any allusion to such controversy be made, if episcopacy had only re-

I am prevented from citing these passages, only by want of time, as they may be found collected in abundance in the learned polemics[1] of our Church. I will merely observe, that of the many fathers in which the mention of Bishops occurs, Clement of Rome is stated to have been ordained by St. Peter; Polycarp to have conversed with the Apostles; and Ignatius to have suffered martyrdom, only a few years[2] after St. John's death, having been then forty years Bishop of Antioch. Finally, no record whatever can be produced of any *church*, governed in any other manner than that which is admitted to have universally prevailed from the second century to the Reformation; nor is any controversial writing on the subject extant, of the time at which Blondel affirms episcopacy to have risen. Now if, notwithstanding all this, we are, in the sixteenth century, to be surprised with the discovery that,

cently reared its head, and was with such rapidity swallowing up another polity, which had been practised by Apostles? We contend that the jurisdiction was always distinguished, and that even where the name was used doubtfully, such usage would be (quanti valeat) rather evidence that the distinction of the jurisdiction was notorious. Ignatius is very clear in his distinction of the three orders.—Vide Ep. to Ephes., §. iv.; Mag., §. iii. iv. xiii.; Trall., xii. xiii. The sense of these cannot be disputed; however the genuineness of the Epistles may have been denied.

[1] See Address to the Reader, which precedes this Discourse.

[2] According to Eusebius, A. D. CX.; to Marianus Scotus, CXII.; to Usher, CVII.; to Lloyd, CVXI.—See Wake. Apost. Fathers.

during the time of Christ and his Apostles, the Church knew nothing of episcopacy, and was governed under an entirely different polity, surely we are entitled to ask how, when Churches were not only fresh from the hands of the Apostles, but were *daily* rising under zealous men, who were themselves contemporary with the Apostles, or at least had abundant facilities of knowing the practice of the Apostles; and when these Churches were rising in regions far distant from each other; how, in such circumstances, one vast corruption was so soon and so completely to overshadow the whole of them; and how that other polity could so entirely vanish from Christendom, that not a trace of its adoption by any one early Church, nor one voice lifted up against such a daring innovation upon the polity of their Master and his Apostles, should be left on record? The theory seems improbable, monstrous[1]. It behoves those who adopt

[1] Bishop Taylor, in his Consecration Sermon, after affirming, upon the testimony of Epiphanius, that at first there were only Bishops and Deacons in the Churches, and that, as the harvest became greater, Presbyters were ordained, and that certain whom he enumerates were, by the universal testimony of the Church, Bishops, proceeds thus: "All which, if there be any faith in Christians that have given their lives for a testimony to the faith, and any truth in their stories; unless we who believe Thucydides and Plutarch, Livy and Tacitus, think that all Church story is a perpetual romance, and that all the brave men, the martyrs, and the doctors of the primitive Church, did conspire, as one man, to abuse all Christendom for ever; I say, unless all these im-

it, not to *call* upon *us* to show our Scripture credentials, but to produce *their own*. For if the Scripture evidence were only equal, the testimony of the Church should turn the scale. On them falls the duty of showing that some other polity was laid down in the Word of God, and laid down, not in one or two *doubtful* and *questionable* texts, but with such unquestionable clearness, that, in deference to such authority, we must (however unable to account for the facts before us) give up the plain testimony of the universal Church[1]. Such, I contend, is the position in which the Church of England stands. The points of our case have, on the face of the question, a strength similar to that which is attributed in law to a title by possession. The holder is not called upon to show his title-deeds; those who dispute his right must first themselves make out a case of their own. Let those who question our title, show the foundations of their own, and not call upon us to make out a title, when the judgment of the whole Church has decided in our favour.

Such, I say, is the position which we are entitled

possible suppositions be admitted, all these whom I have now reckoned were Bishops fixed in several Churches, and had dioceses for their charges."

[1] This is a maxim that should not be lost sight of. It may not be difficult to bring single texts, on which *doubts* and *disputes* might be raised. But these avail nothing against the universal testimony of the Church, and the general tenor of Scripture.

to take up. But, God be praised, those who have leisure for the enquiry need not confine themselves to this. We have no misgivings,—no flaws, which make us fear to produce our title-deeds. We can show the foundations of our polity in Scripture; that the primitive Fathers and the universal Church, though they may have sometimes disfigured the model with incongruous ornaments, yet have preserved its principle and its authority[1], as it came from the hands

[1] It is one of the fallacies of the day to contrast the external circumstances of episcopacy, the accidents of it arising out of the position of the Church, with the external circumstances of the Apostles—circumstances, be it remembered, not embraced by choice, but imposed by necessity, and consequently neither approved nor condemned. Nothing can be more unjust than the inferences drawn from this. The principle and the foundation of episcopal jurisdiction is not altered by these extrinsic accidents, which, in various positions of the Church, and in its various relations with society, may be found to extend its usefulness. They are only means at one time applicable, at others perhaps not applicable, to the end for which episcopacy was ordained. To constitute a comparison between the Apostles and their successors, the circumstances of the Church, of society, and of the individuals, ought to be the same. If those who are so zealous for primitive practice, and so fond of drawing these parallels, would only remember that there is not one rule for applying Gospel principles to the ministers of the Christian community, and another for the laity—if they would only begin by carrying out their principles and their parallel by *first* reducing *themselves* to the state of the primitive Christian society, and then drawing the parallel for the Bishops—I think a marvellous light would break in upon some of them, and they would have much less difficulty in seeing that the circumstances of the society

of the Master Builders. Let us now take a summary view of the foundations of episcopacy, as they appear in the *Word of God.*

Had the Scriptures been silent, analogy would have afforded ground for presuming that the Church of Christ was never to consist of disgregated members, having no common bond of sympathy, no common principle of action, and utterly dead to those social propensities, which were either originally implanted by God in the breast of man, or so powerfully impressed upon him by his necessities, that they seem part of his nature, and, in every age and country, have influenced both his religious and civil relations. But both Jesus himself and his Apostles have expressly, and under a variety of figures, represented His Church as a community[1], with that appropriation of powers and subordination of offices, which are necessary to the order and welfare of any society. They have likened it to a *kingdom;* to an *household* with servants and *rulers* of servants[2]; to a *body*[3] with mem-

might require a change in the *outward circumstances* of its members, whether rulers or subjects, without affecting the *principles* of the society itself. Would a Christian nobleman, for example, think he was acting contrary to the principles of religion, because he did not, as the early Christians, lay his possessions at the Bishops' feet?

[1] The very designation of the Church indicates that those who compose it have, as it were, been chosen and called out from the world, to form themselves into a religious community.

[2] Luke xii. [3] 1 Cor. xii.

bers, each having their proper functions; to an *house* "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone[1]." He, who recognized this social principle in His Church, did not leave it without a model of government, to direct those to whom he should commit it at his death, or those their successors, with whom he expressly declared, he would be "*to the end of the world.*" And he not only appointed rulers in his Church, but himself became their pattern, and showed them, by example, that the authority is not to be assumed at pleasure, but only by lawful calling. We are not left to infer this from his acts, which we might have done; we have the express testimony of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "even Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest, but He that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee[2]."

Having been thus consecrated, he calls others to be with him, for the purpose of assisting him in his ministry during his life, to qualify themselves for being witnesses of his truth, and for governing the Church after his departure into glory. With a solemnity suited to the occasion, having passed the whole of the previous night in prayer, he calls the twelve; he gives them a special title—Apostles,

[1] Eph. xi. 20.

[2] Heb. v. 5.—comp. Matt. iii. 16, 17.

and directs that they are to be with him[1]. Their *number*, not their office, twelve, appears to have been ordained with a view to the twelve heads of the tribes; for to Israel was the Gospel preached during the life of Christ, and for some time after. And to this connexion with the twelve tribes, an allusion appears to be made, when Jesus tells the Apostles they shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel[2]. Afterwards, he sent forth also seventy disciples (probably in both cases fixing the *number*[3] with reference to a number familiar to his countrymen), after the pattern of the seventy[4] elders in the book of Numbers, who were

[1] Mark iii. 14.

[2] Luke xxii. 28—30. The strife of the sons of Zebedee for to sit one on the right hand and the other on the left of our Lord, shows the sense they had of the authority of their office. Their authority is not questioned, only their ambition for precedency rebuked.

[3] I say *number*, for there appears no similarity in their office, nor were they called "elders."

[4] Vid. Hammond. Dissertationes, &c. Dissert. tertia, cap. iv. §. 18. Heylin. from the xi. Numb. referred to by Hammond, thinks they were 72, six to each of the 12, as the term septuagint and 70 was commonly understood as speaking in round numbers, and, applied to Sanhedrim, to mean 72. The case of Numbers xi. is certainly one very much to the point, where the Lord says, "Gather me 70 men of the elders of Israel;" and Moses is said to have "gathered *the* 70 men of the elders," &c. at the *tabernacle*. But there were still *two* in the *camp* upon whom also the Spirit fell, as well as on the rest. With respect to the difference between the office of elders under the Jewish and

inferior to the twelve heads of tribes. No solemnity of prayer precedes their selection: they go forth to preach; they give an account of their mission; and no more is heard of them during our Lord's ministry. They have no place assigned them about his person, no name is appropriated to them, nor is any commission afterwards given to them by Christ or the Spirit, to rule the Church or take his authority. They appear only as a subordinate and secondary class of preachers.

But how different is the case with the Apostles. During Christ's abode upon earth, the authority and regulation of the visible Church, for obvious reasons, centered entirely in Him; the Apostles as yet are merely chosen to minister under Him, to be with Him continually, and to qualify themselves for the important part they were afterwards to act. Only a prospective and subordinate authority had yet been given them[1]. No independent authority could be needed, or exercised, till his death. But then it is given, and given only to the Apostles,

Christian dispensations, there are some good observations in Townsend's Arrangement of the New Testament, vol. ii. 166, in one of those valuable and condensed notes which enrich that work.

[1] Hammond, from the juxta-position of Mar. iii. 14, Luc. xx. 11. 19, Jo. xx. 23, Matt. xxviii. 19, ingeniously argues that the advance of the Apostles by Jesus through the several degrees to the highest order of the ministry may be traced. Vide Dissertationes Quatuor, &c. Dissert. tertia, cap. iv. §. 15—19.

and with every solemnity which could indicate the extent and the perpetuity of their office. Every thing in this transaction denotes a regular, formal transfer of the power to regulate the Church, and to ordain a succession of governors and other officers. St. Matthew[1] expressly declares that the government of the Church was delegated to the eleven, and to the eleven only, by Christ himself; that they were convened specially by Him to a particular spot to receive it. He prefaces it by a declaration, that He is supreme in the Church; *all* power in heaven and in earth had been given to Him; and that in proper time and place they shall receive power. They were to make disciples, as He had done. His commission is *universal—all* nations are to be taught, by them, all things He had commanded. This could not be accomplished, unless they had power to ordain others to assist them. It was *perpetual*, for He is to be with those to whom He delegates this office, "*to the end of the world*;" and therefore implies that the Apostles must have the power of ordaining, not only assistants, but also *successors*, with such powers as the future maintenance and regulation of the Church would require. Not a word appears of any such delegation of his power to the seventy, or to any other bodies or individuals.

If we turn to the Acts of the Apostles, and fol-

[1] Matt. xxviii. 16.

low the course of events there, to the completion of this commission, we shall find the same solemnities and appropriation of power followed up. They are appointed, but they have not yet received the credentials of their calling; and they are directed to *wait* at Jerusalem, till they should, as Jesus had been before them, be *baptized with*, or visibly receive the power of the Holy Ghost, and be endued with those gifts and proofs which the peculiar state of the Church and of ~~her~~ *their* office render necessary.

I have used the very words of Christ, "*baptized* with the Holy Ghost;" and I wish the phrase to be marked. For the link it forms in a complete chain of evidence has never, to my recollection, been sufficiently noticed. Let it be connected with the *visible descent of the Spirit* on Jesus, and the *voice from heaven* at his *baptism*[1], with the declaration of St. Paul, that *Christ* glorified not himself to be made an high priest, but He that said unto him, *thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*[2]; and, finally, with the *visible descent of the Spirit on the Apostles, and their immediate entrance upon their office*[3]; and you have then clearly the Apostles by the same authority, in the *same orderly manner*, invested with a similar jurisdiction over the Church, to that which Christ himself exercised, and in which He sent them forth, as his Father had sent Him. You advance thus as far as the Scriptures can advance. You want

[1] Matt. iii. 16, 17. [2] Heb. v. 5.
[3] Acts ii.

another link, to carry on the same principle in the Church, among the immediate successors of the Apostles. And here it is, with a plain allusion to the above passages, in the words of Clement of Rome, an apostolical man, and, according to primitive testimony, ordained by St. Peter himself. "The Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ therefore was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ; so *both* were *orderly* sent, according to the will of God. For, having received their command, and being thoroughly assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and convinced by the Word of God, with the fulness of the Holy Spirit, they went abroad, publishing *that the kingdom of God was at hand.* And, thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be *bishops* and *ministers* over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit."—*Clem. Rom. Wake's Translation*[1].

[1] Jeremy Taylor (Consecration Sermon) says St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, is by St. Paul called an Apostle: "For there were some whom the Scriptures call the Apostles of our Lord; that is, such which Christ made by his word immediately, or by his Spirit extraordinarily; and even into this number and title, Matthias, and St. Paul, and Barnabas, were accounted*. But the Church also made Apostles †; and these were called by

* 1 Cor. viii. 23. † Phil. ii. 25.

If this does not complete the chain, I know not what moral evidence can establish any historical fact.

But to return to the thread of our observations. Till this power had been "orderly given," we cannot but observe the guarded accuracy of

St. Paul *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, "Apostles of the Churches;" and particularly Epaphroditus was the "Apostle of the Philippians;" —"properly so," saith Pinnasius; and "what is this else but the Bishop?" saith Theodoret; "for *τοὺς νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους ὠνόμαζον ἀποστόλους*, those who are now called Bishops were then called Apostles," saith the same father.

Hammond draws the following parallel between the "*commission*" of Jesus and of the Apostles:

Mirum est quàm hæc a Christo signanter, quàm ad omnem clarissimæ veritatis ignorationem pertinaci sæculo extundendam, accuratè et sollicitè enunciata, quàm fere omnibus, quæ excogitari poterant, dictionum figuris et *schematismis* variata nobis tradantur, *Pater judicium dedit Filio.* Joh. v. 22. *Filius judicium Apostolis dedit.* Matt. xix. 28; Luc. xxii. 30; 1 Cor. vi. 3; 2 Cor. x. 6. *Pater Filio potestatem* dedit *remittendi in terris peccata.* Matt. x. 6. *Filius Apostolis* potestatem dedit *remittendi* itidem *in terris peccata.* Joh. xx. 23. *Pater claves Filio* dedit. Matt. xvi. 19; Isai. xxii. 22; Apoc. iii. 7. *Filius Apostolis claves* dedit. Matt. xvi. 19. *Pater Filio* dedit *sedere* cum eo in *throno* ejus, itidemque *Filius Apostolis* dedit *sedere* cum eo in *throno* ejus. Matt. xix. 28; Luc. xxii. 30. *Pater Filium* dedit *fundamentum*, aut *lapidem angularem* ecclesiæ. Matt. xxi. 42. *Filius Apostolos* dedit *fundamenta* super *fundamento.* Eph. ii. 20. *θεμέλιον Ἀποστόλων ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Pater* denique *Filium ἀπέσταλκε καὶ ἔπεμψε.* Joh. v. 24, et xvii. 18. *Filius* dein Apostolos *ἀπέσταλκε καὶ ἔπεμψε.* Joh. xx. 21.—Dissert. iii. cap. 2. § 13.

the Apostles' conduct. They make no pretensions to the power of ordination. They merely, after having prayed, choose by lot one to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judas; a course they never afterwards adopted (when their powers were fully conferred). I need not describe the scene on the day of Pentecost, when the power was, according to Christ's promise, given, and their divine commission sealed, in the same manner as it had been sealed in Christ's Baptism, by the Spirit, before an assemblage[1] capable of estimating the sufficiency of their credentials. Up to this point a full and formal account of the nature and source of their authority is given. It cannot be more particular. The illustrations of its application to practice are to be found only incidentally in the Epistles and in the Acts of the Apostles—a history not professing to give much more than a brief account of the beginnings of the Church in Judæa and among the proselytes, its opening to the Gentiles, and the travels of St. Paul[2]. The notices in the history are

[1] Acts ii. 8—11.

[2] "Their doctrine, indeed, doth plainly appear in their writings; their successors doe not. For how should the Apostles declare by their pennes who succeeded them after their deathes? Is not the whole Church of Christ a lawful and sufficient witnesse in that case? If we believe not the Churches that were directed and ordered by the Apostles' preaching and presence, nor their schollers that lived with them and next succeeded in their roomes; who that wise is will beleeve our bare surmises and conjectures of

few, but not fewer than from the professed object of it, and the progress of the rising Church struggling with persecution, we might expect, particularly when the jurisdiction of the Apostles could not be doubted. In the Epistles, an unhesitating [1] tone of authority prevails, every where bearing evident marks of a consciousness on the part of the writers, that it is as unquestioned by those whom they address [2] as it is by themselves.

The time warns me that I must not attempt to adduce passages in support of these positions. But

things done 1500 yeares before wee were borne?"—Bilson, cap. 12. 223.

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 6. 1 Cor. xi. *passim;* xii. ditto; xiii. ditto; xvi. 1. 10, 11. Epistles to Tim. and Titus, *passim.*—Numberless passages might be pointed out; and the tone is found to prevail, not here and there only, but through all the Apostolic writings.

[2] "No Christian Church could, in respect to their (the Apostles') authority, aspire to independent rights, on the ground of being a voluntary association, without a dereliction of the very principles of Christianity, without disregarding the moral evidence which attested the truth of the Gospel. No such contempt of Apostolic authority is chargeable on the primitive Churches: on the contrary, there was a general disposition to defer, in all respects, to their directions; and in the first ages of the Church, the societies in which an Apostle, or *the companion of an Apostle,* had presided, were looked upon as claiming a sort of pre-eminent dignity."—Conder, *Prot. Nonconformity.*

Bilson asserted, long ago, the same; and shrewdly questions *when* and by *what authority* this principle of obedience to the episcopal rule of the Apostles, and men appointed by the Apostles, was altered.

I am consoled by the certainty, that these general characters of the Acts and the Epistles are matters of notoriety to every well-informed congregation, and I request any who doubts to read St. Paul's Epistles, with a view to this characteristic. I contend not here for mere verbal distinctions, nor shall I enter into the questions which have been raised upon the application of the term Presbyter to the Apostles as well as to other teachers, or the supposed application of ἐπίσκοπος to the mere Presbyter. All I shall observe on this head is, that though every Apostle or Bishop certainly was a Presbyter, it will not follow that every Presbyter was an Apostle or Bishop[1]. The Acts of the

[1] I say *supposed* application to the *mere* Presbyter, meaning thereby that the Episcopalian has at least full as much ground to question such application of episcopacy in certain passages, as his opponents have to affirm it. As, for example, in Titus i. 5, compared with verse 7, our opponents say, that here mere Presbyters, in the restricted sense of the word, were spoken of as Bishops. I contend, not only from the application of the title Episcopus given to them in the 7th verse, but from the very terms and tenor of the sentence itself, that they were not spoken of as ordinary Presbyters, but merely as of men of age and gravity, and also in the form of expression familiar to the Jews and holy writers—who gave to all the heads of the people, as an appellation of reverence, the name of Elders. St. Paul says, I left thee in Crete, &c., that thou shouldest (not, as our translation has it, "ordain," but) *appoint*, or set, Presbyters over each city, as I had arranged with thee. καταστῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, a direction not ill-suited to Crete, called ἑκατόμπολις, the land of a hundred cities. The phrase κατὰ πόλιν does not necessarily imply

Apostles and general tenor of the Scriptures all speak the same language as the early Church, and are not to be shaken by a few ingenious verbal distinctions and niceties upon one or two disputable texts. The question is not to be treated, as it often is, as though the presumption were against episcopacy, when it is the reverse, both by the testimony of the Church and general tone of the Bible.

I take my stand upon the manifest intention of the commission given to the Apostles, and to the Apostles only, upon the broad marks of appropriation of authority—upon the distinct tenure of power, ordination, and direction which the Apostles display in the exercise of their functions[1], and

that a Bishop was appointed to every city, but only to each city where he was *required.*

The opponent of episcopacy may reply, I interpret this the other way. Be it so. Then to what better arbitration can we refer the question, than the practice of the Apostles, and men to whom the Apostles delegated their authority, such as Timothy and Titus—the general tenor of Scripture, and the testimony of the Church? I merely take this as an example, not meaning to enter into the wide field of controversy on single texts.

[1] An excessive importance appears to be attached, in this controversy, to the question whether the *terms* Episcopus or Presbyter were distinctly appropriated or not in Scripture. The main point is, whether the *office* existed, was appropriated, and delegated to successors, and continued in the Church. That it was so by the Apostles, and by Timothy and others, and by the universal Church, there appears to me a mass of evidence which cannot be affected by the time at which the mere *terms* became distinctly and strictly appropriated.

which they enjoin to those to whom they commit

Bishop Taylor says,—1st, That the word "Presbyter" is but an honourable appellative used amongst the Jews, as "Alderman" amongst us; but it signifies no order at all, nor was ever used in Scripture to signify any distinct company or order of clergy: and this appears not only by an induction in all the enumerations of the offices ministerial in the New Testament*, where to be a Presbyter is never reckoned either as a distinct office or a distinct order, but by its being indifferently communicated to all the superior clergy, and all the princes of the people.

2ndly, The second thing I intended to say, is this; that although all the superior clergy had not only one but divers common appellatives, all being called πρεσβύτεροι and διάκονοι, even the Apostolate itself being called a Deaconship†, yet it is evident, that before the common appellatives were fixed into names of propriety, they were as evidently distinguished in their offices and powers, as they are at this day in their names and titles.

A great stress has been laid upon Jerome's authority—his meaning grievously perverted—by those who wished to represent him as affirming that there was no distinction between the *office* of the Bishop and the Presbyter, unless by the custom of the Church. For he himself distinctly admits that the Bishop had exclusively the power of ordination: "Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat." He recites, as among the *Apostolic traditions*, that Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons have the same relative gradations as Aaron, his sons, and the Levites, and says the Presbyter is contained in the Bishop as the less in the greater. If his authority, therefore, standing alone, could be set against that of the earlier fathers and the universal Church, it would not avail; for he [illegible] no argu-

* Rom. xii. 6. Eph. iv. 11. 1 Cor. xii. 28.

† Acts i. 25.

their authority [1]. They, and they only, ordain ministers—they confirm—they issue their decrees to the Church—they receive appeals in matters of controversy—they regulate all the rising Churches. It is true that, at first, they have no specified districts over which each presides (save that, from the unanimous testimony of the early Church, James appears to have been very early Bishop of Jerusalem [2]); but this is again precisely what,

ments to prove any thing more, than that, until the schism at Corinth spoken of by St. Paul, one saying, I am of Paul, another I am of Apollos, &c., the Gospel was preached, and the Church governed, by the common council of persons who were *promiscuously termed* Bishops and Presbyters. The words were applied to the same persons—those persons were both Bishops and Presbyters—but he does not deny that there were two offices. Even he not only recognizes the two offices, though at first exercised by the same individual, but professes to fix the time and the cause (the Corinthian schism) of their being separated, and separated by the Apostles, and placed in the same superiority and subordination as Aaron and his sons. The Apostles, we know, called themselves elders, but we also know that there were elders who were not Apostles, nor pretended to Apostolical functions. The promiscuous use of the name is no proof that the offices were not distinct.

But it is unnecessary, in this pamphlet, to enter upon the questions of Jerome's theory. The reader will find it well sifted in Hammond's work on Episcopacy, Dissert. 2nd, cap. 27, 28, and 29; and also in Fran. Amessana, Difficilia S. Hieron. loca.

[1] Titus i. 5.

[2] Hooker cites in proof of this, Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18; also the direct testimony of Eusebius and Jerome. Ecc. Polity, lib. vii. §. 4. This is fatal to the pretensions of Rome; and, indeed, it is

from the state of things, we should naturally expect. The Church was at first confined to the Jewish nation and the proselytes of the gate—therefore the principal seat of episcopal government, is Jerusalem. At first, all the offices of the ministerial character centered in the Apostles: they performed the functions of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons [1], and did not establish the subordinate offices till the increase of the Church required them. Their labours also, for some time, must have been rather of a missionary character—to travel about—to make converts—to settle and regulate small congregations, not sufficiently populous, nor protected from jealousy or persecution, to have a separate episcopal government, or be more than parishes under an ordinary Presbyter, with the episcopal superintendence of the Apostles. Afterwards, as Churches became firmly established, and Bishops placed over them, the archiepiscopal superintendence of the Apostles (directed by the Spirit) over those infant establishments [2] appears

evident that the Bishop of Rome had no other precedency than that which the Church might reasonably concede to him as Bishop of the chief city of that empire under which they were. He had no right to rule over independent Churches. The principle of the concession, one of social convenience, not Divine institution, is followed out in practice in the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches, when Constantinople became the seat of empire.

[1] See Acts vi. 1—7.

[2] 2 Cor. xi. 28.

to have been continued. This seems to have been a chief object in St. Paul's travels, which so largely occupy the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles.

But while the exercise of their superiority and special power is to be traced occasionally in the Acts, the language of the Epistles, as I have already observed (especially that of St. Paul), is almost every where that of a ruler and a superior officer in the Church, directing not only the laity, but the ministers of religion. And in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, his language is not only that of a Bishop, but of one addressing with archiepiscopal authority and paternal affection Bishops themselves—men who were themselves rulers, and who had authority to ordain elders, and under whose jurisdiction elders were placed. Especially to Timothy does he speak with these views, and also with a plain reference to the office being continued after his own and Timothy's decease in lawful succession for ever.

I regret being compelled to hurry over this interesting portion of our subject, but am sensible that with the utmost compression I must exceed the limits which, on such an occasion as this, I ought to claim. I must therefore very briefly touch upon the abundant marks of the recognition of Timothy's episcopal character, which was discernible in St. Paul's Epistles to him. St. Paul reminds him of the apostolic authority from which his commission is derived, and of the firmness with which he ought

to exercise it. "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands. For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power[1]." He tells him that he appointed him to Ephesus, and that he is to use his *power* in ruling teachers—in *charging* "some that they teach no other doctrine[2]." He gives him instructions as to the character and conduct of a Bishop[3]. He suggests the points in which he is to reprehend or praise the conduct of the Deacons under him[4]. He cautions him that heresies must arise, and teaches him what course to take with respect to them[5]. He declares distinctly his jurisdiction over elders, and gives him some cautions how to exercise it[6]. He tells him to inflict public censure[7]. He warns him, with a most solemn appeal to "God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect Angels," to use his authority in these matters with *impartiality*[8]. He recognizes his power of ordination, and guards him against rashly, and without due examination, admitting any to the Ministry[9]! He authorizes and enjoins him also to provide for a succession in the Church, and that all those things which he had learned from an Apostle before many witnesses, and which

[1] 2 Tim. i. 6, 7.
[2] 1 Tim. i. 3.
[3] 1 Tim. ii.
[4] Ibid. v. 12, &c.
[5] Ibid. iv. *passim*.
[6] Ibid. v. 1. 17. 19.
[7] Ibid. v. 20.
[8] Ibid. v. 21.
[9] Ibid. v. 22.

he was to keep until the *appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ*[1], he should "*commit* to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also[2]." And lastly, in the words of the text, the awful and *general* charge is given to him *before God* and the *Lord Jesus Christ.* Can we read these instructions and exhortations, and regard them as given to any other than a *Bishop,* or *successor* of St. Paul in his apostolical jurisdiction, as St. Paul and his fellow Apostles were *successors* of Jesus himself, and intended to convey his authority to the faithful men, with whom He promised to be "*to the end of the world?*"

Even Milton, furiously prejudiced as he was, admitted that Timothy was a vicegerent of St. Paul[3], but only with a temporary power. How far will prejudice mislead great minds! Let any read the chapter from which the text is taken, and set the grave words of the Apostle against the gratuitous assumption of the poet. It is won-

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 14.

[2] 2 Tim. ii. 2. and 1 Tim. vi. 14. Jesus also, giving his injunctions to the Apostles, tells them to teach *all* nations—all things whatsoever he had commanded or taught them; and couples it with the promise of being with them "*to the end of the world.*" This is of precisely the same import as St. Paul's injunction in these texts.

[3] Pierce says: "I do not, indeed, deny, that in every Church there was one chief Presbyter, who was then *constant* Moderator. I am so far from blaming this custom, that I think it was derived from the Holy Scriptures."—*Vind. of Dissenters.*

derful how any man could hear or read them, and not be struck with the awful seriousness with which St. Paul seems to labour to impress Timothy with the magnitude of his charge—with the complete episcopal jurisdiction with which he is invested—with the entire responsibility which was shortly to devolve on him as a successor of the Apostles.

The charge before God and the Lord Jesus, the reminiscence of the day of judgment, the earnest injunction to *preach;* to be instant in season and out of season; to *exhort, reprove, rebuke,*—all the various offices of a chief ruler; the prediction of the rising impatience of sound doctrine; the entreaty to vigilance; the allusion to his own approaching departure; and to the crown of glory laid up for the faithful servant; present an assemblage of circumstances and cautions, which are such as are consistent with a zealous Apostle, under an expectation of being called away, instructing a successor in his important office; and they correspond with the testimony and practice of the Church carried down from the days of the Apostle to the present.

On the many duties which from these Epistles I might, as a servant of the Most High God, reminding, not instructing, suggest to those now to be consecrated, our limits will not permit me to dwell. And it is the less a subject of regret, as in the one case from public testimony, and in the other from

both public testimony and personal knowledge, I have ample grounds of assurance that they are not persons who would lightly or unprepared encounter such a fearful responsibility. In the individual who is to be consecrated to the Diocese of Montreal, we have one who has been long tried in all the duties of the ministry, and whose usefulness is placed on honourable record in the proceedings of our Church Societies. He has had also to prove his devotion to the cause of his Master, as St. Paul did, in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in weariness and painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in cold, and in those privations and hardships which the climate and the difficulties of the country have compelled him to encounter, and which he has encountered, as one conscious of the service in which they were required.

Of the other, I can speak from closer acquaintance. I know him, I hope he permits me to say, as a friend: I know him by the respect paid to genuine piety, solid learning, discreet zeal, firm integrity, combined with unaffected meekness and Christian gentleness. I know him by the affection and veneration of those who, from his youth up, have proved his heart and his understanding. And, as far as I dare pronounce such a judgment upon human character, I cannot entertain a doubt, but that with a sound knowledge of his subject, he has well considered the nature of his charge, and is, by God's grace, well qualified to undertake it.

We have good ground to hope and believe that both these tried ministers must have searched the Scriptures, remembered the authority and the love of Him who left the command to feed his sheep. They must have thought upon the doom of the perfidious and hireling shepherd; they have by faith lifted up the veil of earth, and gazed, with a chastened hope and fearful consideration, on the awful prospect beyond the grave, and the account expected by Him, who himself said to the Father, "Of those whom Thou gavest me, have I lost none." They have seen their work before them, and they must often, on their bended knees, have implored their heavenly Father, in the name of his blessed Son, to give them that grace which alone will be sufficient to enable them to render an account of their trust in the great day with joy. They will also here, in our presence, publicly offer up such prayers in the language, and with the highest ministers, of our Church. We are assembled as their witnesses. Brethren, let not those prayers ascend to the throne of grace as from isolated beings, in whose cause no sympathy is felt, no charity glows; let them not ascend as the cry of watchmen on their solitary towers, but as from the camp of our Israel; as the voice of faithful leaders and holy champions, being girt with arms of Christian chivalry, and vowing true devotion to an heavenly cause. Let not their prayers and vows ascend alone. Let our hearts be lifted up with theirs,

commending them to the God of our battle; supplicating for them that strength in which they may have "victory, and triumph, against the devil, the world, and the flesh."

For, independently of the ordinary importance of the episcopal office, and the consequences which may result from the establishment of that Apostolical polity over countries of vast extent, of probably future greatness, there are many circumstances, both in the present times (pregnant as they are with unsettled notions of discipline and doctrine), and in the character of the colonies themselves, one of them especially, which should cause us to take a deep interest in the subjects of the present consecration.

In Canada, indeed, episcopacy has been for some time established; but who (looking at the vast extent and increasing population) can think a second Bishop superfluous? Poverty and enterprise daily impel our countrymen in shoals to emigrate from the crowded cities of their native land, and to fill the wilds of America with multitudes of religionists of every shade, and with others of no creed, or with at best very unsettled notions of religion. The Romanist, too, is there in power, ready to catch up these stragglers. Shall the Episcopal Church of Protestant England have no watchmen placed to guide them into her saving truths and godly discipline? Could such be a Christian sentiment, or such the policy of a Protestant State?

In Australia, the jurisdiction of a resident Bishop has not heretofore been established; but it is a most important district. He who will have in that country to root our apostolical discipline, to maintain sound doctrine, to cause the word of salvation to be heard, to reprove, rebuke, and exhort,—will have no light responsibility; nor has he, or the objects of his episcopal charge, an ordinary claim on our Christian sympathy. Like Canada, it is the resort of those whom poverty or enterprise have sent forth; but it has also a large and continual accession of another description. *There* are those who have publicly borne the brand of Satan; there are the outcasts of our Israel; there are the children of crime and disgrace. Into the bosom of that fair land have we poured out those who were a pollution and pest to our own. Surely we have a Christian duty to be paid to her. England owes her some boon, and a noble boon she will confer upon her in the establishment of that Gospel polity which Christ established, his Apostles illustrated, and his Church has maintained, and which, like its Divine Founder, has gone about every where doing good. It is a work worthy of this great nation, and one that ought to rejoice the hearts of a Christian people. Are we to have no regard for God's ordinance? Are we to hold true or false faith as matters of indifference? Are we to use our Colonies merely for our own convenience, and offer them

nothing in return? Are we to be utterly regardless of their spiritual welfare? Are we to draw from them their wealth, and not to give them freely of that which we have freely received? May we not apply to our long-favoured country, as well as to individuals, the counsel of Jesus, "Make to yourselves *friends* of the mammon of unrighteousness?" Apply some portion of that with which God has blessed you to this holy purpose. Make, Christian and Protestant England, make to yourself *friends*, who may plead your cause when your statesmen shall find no device, and your orators shall be struck dumb with terror and confusion. Establish upon strong foundations, and with spacious gates, a refuge for your outcasts, that they who wandered from the home of their earthly fathers in poverty or enterprise, may find a reception in the house of their heavenly Father, and gather, even in the trackless wilderness, the riches of his grace; that they who left our shores in judgment, may turn to their Saviour for mercy, and they who passed hence under the stern escort of the fasces, may enter the Church of the Redeemed under the bright banner of the Cross. These may be our friends, when England and all its might, and all its riches, and all its glories, shall be as the grass that withereth, and the flower that fadeth.

To gather together these outcasts, and lay the foundation of a Church, into which they may be

collected in Christian love and Gospel truth, our brethren are now to be consecrated by those lawfully authorised. Shall not our hearts be with them? May I not address them, and "bid them God speed," in the name of us all? May I not say, on your behalf as well as my own—Go, Brethren; go with our blessings and our prayers. Go among those whom your country hath sent forth weeping, and may you, by the grace of God, bring many back to their Lord with joy. Go; and may the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, be with you;—may the Captain of our salvation be your leader; the Spirit of the Lord your strength and comfort. Go; guard and cherish every where your [illegible]ions of the tree of life, under whose refreshing shade the weary and heavy laden may be refreshed, and from whose goodly boughs Britain hereafter may entwine an imperishable wreath,—a wreath that shall shine with brightest lustre, even in that universal conflagration, when the heavens shall roll together as a shrivelled scroll, and the victor's laurels, the garlands of pleasure, and the crowns of policy and ambition, shall be dross and ashes. And should it please the Sovereign Disposer of all things, that affliction should befal this nation, which has been as the signet in the Lord's right hand, and that the candlestick of our Church should be cast down, may her children in their humiliation have the comfort of beholding, in many and distant realms,

the noblest trophies of her former glory and usefulness,—her *episcopal Churches*, in which many dutiful sons may remember her with blessings, and speak of her as Bishop Hall, one of her own honoured pastors, spoke of a defender of episcopacy in the primitive Church.

"Let me, therefore, confidently shut up all with that resolute word of that blessed martyr and saint, Ignatius: '*Let all things be done to the honour of God; give respect to your Bishop, as you would God should respect you. My soul for theirs which obey their Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons. God grant that my portion may be the same as theirs!*' And let my soul have the same share with that blessed Martyr that said so. Amen."

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.